arXiv:1606.08714v1 [physics.hist-ph] 20 Jun 2016

Comment on "Scientific Regress" (*First Things* May 2016)

J. I. Katz
Dept. Physics, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 63130

June 29, 2016

Abstract

Response to William A. Wilson on the limits and fallibility of science.

William A. Wilson points to many of the ills of contemporary science. Some of them are ineluctable features of human nature; science is done by scientists, who have all the flaws of human beings. In the search of reputation and career they become "success-oriented", weighting evidence in favor of their discoveries more than that against. The same psychology that leads a soldier to suppress fear leads the scientist to suppress skepticism, but what is necessary for the soldier is destructive in a scientist.

Human nature cannot be changed, but the conditions under which it operates can. Excessive competitive pressures lead to corner-cutting. That has simple solutions: train fewer scientists, spread research support more broadly and thinly, and abandon the pretense that the quality of scientific research can be quantified in the same manner as the phenomena the scientist observes. Award the same kudos to the scientist who disproves a previously accepted result as to one who made the original, now discredited, discovery.

But there is more that needs to be done. Almost every paper in the branches of science with the most irreproducible results contains a formal statistical analysis "demonstrating" its significance. Biomedical research teams generally include a professional biostatistician. No paper can be published without a formal demonstration of its statistical validity, and the chance of its result being the product of random chance must be less than 5%, and often turns out to be very much less.

Yet roughly half of such results are not reproducible, and often the problem is not that the original researchers didn't allow for the large number of possible hypotheses (stones in the field, in Wilson's article). Biostatisticians are neither stupid nor dishonest. The problem is that formal statistical analysis cannot allow for systematic bias. Perhaps the apparent benefits of a daily glass of wine result not from the wine, but from something else: perhaps social wine drinkers are the kind of people who follow doctors' orders, for example. In physics there is a saying that half of all "three sigma" results are wrong; that would happen 0.3% of the time if statistical analysis described the real world.

In more theoretical branches of science a different problem arises, the use of elaborate computer codes to model complex phenomena. Modern codes contain our best understanding of many interacting processes, derived from fundamental principles or simpler experiments. Yet these interact in poorly understood ways, making inferences uncertain. The National Ignition Campaign's calculations, based on empirical data and fundamental physical laws, predicted that a pellet of fusion fuel would ignite, but it didn't.

The problem is worse in fields like climate that lack the vast base of data available to fusion researchers; climate models are calibrated by our single climate. The physics of greenhouse gases and warming was understood qualitatively in the 1890's, but the predictive power of even the best modern calculations remains uncertain; different groups make predictions that disagree by a factor of two. This is perfect ground for the Cult of Science, its leaders lured by the scent of possible catastrophe (who wouldn't like to save humanity?), advertising the latest untestable predictions and demanding action NOW.

Science gets some very important things right. We can send a probe to Mars and have it arrive within a few hundred feet of target. We can analyze the DNA of a microbe, or of people, and determine the history of their ancestors. And much more. But unless we recognize the limits of our methods and our understanding, we will be led astray.